

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NINTU XI GILMORE-BEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEBORAH M. SCHNEIDER, *et*
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-10689
Honorable Robert J. White
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford

**ORDER SUSPENDING ORDER TO MEET AND CONFER, GRANTING
DEFENDANTS LEAVE TO MOVE TO COMPEL, AND DENYING AS
MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND HER MOTION
TO COMPEL (ECF NO. 69)**

The Court held a hearing on March 26, 2025, to try to get the parties' discovery efforts on track after they were derailed by Plaintiff Nintu Xi Gilmore-Bey's resistance to productive and cooperative communication. During that hearing, Gilmore-Bey was hostile and uncooperative, talking over and arguing with the Court, refusing to answer questions, and demanding that the Court answer her own questions. Defendants also reported that Gilmore-Bey has failed to respond to written discovery and refused to appear for her deposition.

In an earlier order, after Gilmore-Bey failed to appear for a hearing, the Court directed the parties to meet and confer about their discovery disputes and stayed discovery pending a motion hearing in May 2025. ECF No. 66, PageID.376-377, 380. The Court also noted that no new discovery motions could be filed in the interim. *Id.* at 380. Gilmore-Bey filed five new motions despite this order. See ECF No. 68; ECF No. 69; ECF No. 70, ECF No. 71; ECF No. 72.

Because Gilmore-Bey has flouted court orders, is unwilling to engage in meaningful discussions, and has exhibited hostility both in her written filings and during the hearing, the Court suspends the order for the parties to meet and confer. Defendants may move to compel discovery and seek sanctions by April 2, 2025. Gilmore-Bey must respond by April 16, 2025, and defendants may reply by April 23, 2025. The parties must also appear at the motion hearing scheduled for May 5, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., unless the Court cancels the hearing because Gilmore-Bey's response to defendants' motion shows the same unproductive hostility and lack of merit. As the Court warned Gilmore-Bey on the record, further acts of hostility and resistance that hinder the proceedings will not be tolerated and may give rise to sanctions, including a recommendation to dismiss the case.

Last, Gilmore-Bey moved for leave to amend her motion to compel. ECF No. 69. The Court considered and denied her amended motion to compel. ECF No. 81. Thus, her motion for leave to amend it is **DENIED** as moot.

s/Elizabeth A. Stafford
ELIZABETH A. STAFFORD
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: March 27, 2025

NOTICE TO PARTIES ABOUT OBJECTIONS

Within 14 days of being served with this order, any party may file objections with the assigned district judge. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The district judge may sustain an objection only if the order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636. **“When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge’s ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in full force and effect unless and until it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge.”** E.D. Mich. LR 72.2.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that this document was served on counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court’s ECF System to their email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on March 27, 2025.

s/Davon Allen
DAVON ALLEN
Case Manager